DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 816 JC 010 087

TITLE	Education Master Plan Update, Issue 6. A Regular Report on Hearings of the Joint Legislative Committee To Develop a Master Plan for Education.
INSTITUTION	Community Coll. League of California, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	2000-10-00
NOTE	5p.; Produced under the direction of Rita Mize.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; Intercollegiate Cooperation; Partnerships in Education; *Transfer Rates (College); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	California Master Plan for Higher Education; California State Postsecondary Education Comm; Community College League of California

ABSTRACT

California government, college, and university representatives gathered to discuss transfer and articulation issues as part of the ongoing work of the Joint Legislative Committee To Develop a Master Plan for Education. According to attendees: (1) the probable degree attainment rate of a student with direct access to UC or CSU is 70%. In comparison, while 70% of community college applicants for transfer are accepted, only 85% of the community college units transfer, and 70% of transfer students complete their degrees, making the cumulative risk to attending a community college a 30% probability; (2) improved student awareness and more "human contact" (faculty-to-faculty communication and more counseling for students) increase student transfer. However, a recent survey indicated that 47.5% of community colleges have an articulation officer less than half-time, and many have transfer center directors less than full-time; (3) a recent rise in the number of transfers to both CSU and UC was documented, in contrast to a drop during the early 1900s. CSU is committed to increase the number of eligible transfer students by 5% per year; (4) the online ASSIST system (http://www.assist.org) is now California's official source for transfer course information; (5) CPEC data may undercount transfers; longitudinal rather than cross sectional data may be needed; and (6) the National Student Loan Clearinghouse is coming online with more complete data. (PGS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Issue 6
October 2000

Community College League

Education Master Plan Update

A regular report on Hearings of the Joint Legislative Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education
distributed to CEOs and governing board members of the California community colleges

ED 448 816

Committee Addresses Transfer and Articulation

Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education—Kindergarten through University

Senators:
Dede Alpert, Chair
Richard Alarcon
Betty Karnette
Bruce McPherson
Kevin Murray
Jack O'Connell
Charles Poochigian
Richard Rainey
John Vasconcellos

Assemblymembers:
Kerry Mazzoni, Co-Vice Chair
Ted Lempert, Co-Vice Chair
Jim Cunneen,
Dean Florez
Sarah Reyes
Gloria Romero
George Runner
Jack Scott
Virginia Strom-Martin
Tom Calderon (Alternate)
George Nakano (Alternate)

Five of the twenty members—including Chair Dede Alpert, Vice Chair Kerry Mazzoni, Richard Alarcon, Virginia Strom-Martin, and John Vasconcellos—of the Jt Committee to Review the Master Plan Committee, held a four-hour hearing at San Diego City College's new Educational Technology Center on Tuesday October 10th to discuss transfer and articulation with representatives of the three public segments and the independent colleges.

The day was structured with an introductory panel of CPEC staff regarding their transfer data, followed by three-person panels on: Student Transfer Experiences (Juanita Price, President of CalSACC for community colleges); Understanding Course Articulation (Linda Collins, President of the ASCCC); Transfer Policies, Programs and Practices (Constance Carroll, President of SD Mesa College); and Measures for Assessing the Effectiveness of the Transfer Function (Christopher Cabaldon, Vice Chancellor, COCCC.)

CPEC Data

Members were presented with CPEC data showing that the numbers of transfers to both CSU and UC are rising again after dropping during the decade of the 90's. CPEC staff cited their 1996 report on transfer which indicated that while policies and programs are improving, increased information to improve student awareness, as well as more "human contact" (through faculty to faculty communication and more counseling for students) are essential for improving student transfer.

Assemblyman Alarcon indicated his interest in the percentage of students from underrepresented populations at community colleges because these are the students from whom transfers are determined. He said only by knowing these numbers can one determine whether the disparity between groups is growing or not. He also requested information on the success rate (i.e., percentage who receive BA degrees) of

JC010087

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Robertson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

those who initially enroll in community colleges.

CPEC staff showed the committee data on the community colleges which are consistently top-feeder schools to UC and CSU. (In a later panel, Christopher Cabaldon reminded the committee members that a similar number of the same CSU and UC campuses are the primary recipients of the majority of community college students.)

Student Experiences

Students discussed the difficulties of understanding the complexities of transfer options; unknown deadlines; the tendency of many students to be placebound; insufficient information about IGETC and the General Education agreements; unawareness of the ASSIST system; and the need for counselors in much greater numbers and with far more knowledge. In response to a question from Alarcon, Juanita Price supported a single "universal" set of transfer courses.

Understanding Course Articulation

This panel began with a presentation by Eric Taggart who summarized articulation and explained the differences in transferring general units, GE and IGETC courses, and articulation agreements to the committee. Taggart also explained that ASSIST is now California's official source for course information and can be found at www.assist.org. As Taggart spoke of attempts to improve communication about ASSIST, both Chair Alpert and students in the audience indicated no awareness of ASSIST. Alarcon expressed concern about the ability of students to access ASSIST since many students attend college to learn the use of computers and thus may be unable to access ASSIST data at the beginning of their college years. Taggart responded that many colleges have computers and assistants on campus to assist students in the use of ASSIST.

When Taggart noted that ASSIST efforts have been targeted to high-transfer colleges, Vasconcellos objected, saying that the lowest transfer colleges are the ones needing the marketing.

Kathy Kennedy a CSU faculty member began discussing various positive aspects of GE breadth requirements, noting that CSU accepts all eligible cc transfer students, although not in their major of choice. Alarcon interrupted and noted that the annual number of transfer students has remained even over the past ten years, with a real drop since 1990, while the California population is exploding. He asserted that students are completing their work at community colleges because they can't transfer. Alarcon became more upset as Kennedy explained that the numbers of transfers were determined by legislative determination. Alarcon denied any role in these determinations and expressed concern about the "quota of community college transfer students."

When Alison Jones, assistant vice chancellor for CSU explained that CSU admits all eligible upper division students and denied that there were quotas, Alarcon responded that CSU "changes the rules and raises the GPA to keep out community college students."

Alpert later indicated disagreement with Alarcon, citing the failure to prepare K-12 students for higher education and the lack of support from impoverished homes. She indicated that failure in other parts of the public education system has affected diversity in higher education.

Linda Collins noted the increased stature and professionalism of community college faculty as a result of AB 1725 and its attendant positive effects upon relationships among the faculty senates in developing articulation agreements and the IGETC and GE agreements. She strongly argued for increased funding because the "1725 revolution" is incomplete due to inadequate articulation funding and cited a median counseling ratio of 1200:1 with some colleges as high as 5000:1.

Collins stressed the importance of more "targeted attention" for articulation because a recent survey showed that 47.5% of community colleges have an

articulation officer less than half-time, with many transfer center directors less than full-time.

Constance Carroll presented a survey of the positive activities in her area including the San Diego and Imperial Counties Community College Association (SDICCCA) in which CEOs from the region's community colleges meet with their counterparts at UC and CSU to plan on a regional basis. A recent study showed that 49.4% of transfers from SD Mesa were to independent colleges; this trend is magnified when popular majors are impacted at local public institutions.

Carroll commended the committee for recognizing that all segments are responsible for transfer and offered the following suggestions:

- the three public segments should operate regionally throughout the state, CSUs need to work on the impediment imposed by impacted majors; and
- impaction can be reduced by funding summer sessions.

Alison Jones spoke of the many positive aspects of the CSU Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with community colleges, especially for work toward 10 majors to be articulated on a statewide basis with lower division work at the community colleges. The MOU also calls for collaboration on a two-year degree —the "AA Transfer Degree"—which would be acceptable at all CSU campuses, and noted that 28 community college campuses already have regional AA transfer degrees.

Jones noted that a couple of CSU campuses have already instituted dual admission for incoming community college students, and the system is encouraging expansion of this policy. CSU also is committed to invigorate the transfer center partnership and to increase the number of eligible transfer students by 5% per year.

Finally, Jones cited the community college entitlement grant within the Cal Grant program as the most significant piece of California legislation in the past thirty years.

Francisco Hernandez of UC Santa Cruz offered three efforts of that campus:

1. Involving potential transfer students in research with UCSC faculty while at community college; these students then are to make presentations at local high schools on their experience;
2. One college on the UCSC campus is designated as the transfer college, and contains transfer services, the transfer center and special living arrangements;
3. Fourteen community colleges currently have a dual admissions policy with UCSC.

The final panel discussed measures for assessing the effectiveness of transfer with Christopher Cabaldon noting that while 70% of the applicants for transfer are accepted, 85% of community college units transfer, and 70% of transfer students complete their degrees, the cumulative risk to attending a community college is a 30% probability.

Cabaldon noted that by comparison, the probable success rate given direct access to UC or CSU is 70%—this explains the pervasive fear of attending community colleges. Other problems are that the least money is spent on those with the least skills; there is too much complexity and uncertainty for community college students, and transfer is both costly and scary for students. The complexity and uncertainty can be dealt with by counseling and outreach and simplifying the process, said Cabaldon.

There is a relationship between enrollment management and transfer. Changes in deadlines are "durable perceptions" about the viability of transfer as an option. Short-term strategies of the systems often have long-term consequences.

The period of transfer decline was due to the cohort decline, as admission rates declined each year during the recession of the early 90's, Cabaldon said. "A single measure doesn't work due to the data issues—although we're more optimistic regarding data matching."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cabaldon charged that CPEC data has consistently undercounted transfers. The National Student Loan Clearinghouse is coming on-line with more complete data. Cabaldon's feeling was that we need to look at longitudinal, rather than cross-sectional, data.

The problem with determining transfer rates is the denominator—whether one should use the number of students who report transfer as a goal, or the number who actually complete 6 or 12 transferable units. Cabaldon further noted that we also need to look at the time dimension, since community college students, who tend to be part-time students, sometimes need more time to complete their work.

Cabaldon also argued for separating populations into those eligible for UC or CSU after high school and those who were not eligible. Then one may want to calculate the chance of obtaining a BA if one is in the top 12.5% or the top 1/3 of their graduating class, but they start at a community college.

Cabaldon also felt that we should distinguish between place-bound and mobile students. He noted that another important measure is post-transfer performance since it is important to retain success as we increase the number of transfer students.

- The committee can be reached online at www.sen.ca.gov/masterplan/
- At press time, the next hearing had not been set.
- **Rita Mize** can be reached as noted below.

Community College League of California

2017 O Street
Sacramento CA 95814
Phone: 916-444-8641
Fax: 916-444-2954
Email: rmize@ccleague.org

We're on the Web
www.ccleague.org

Since enactment of the Master Plan for Higher Education in 1960, there has been a review of the plan and its provisions approximately every ten years, with the last major review in the mid-80's. At that time, there was a two-fold process by a state appointed citizens' group—the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education—followed by a legislative committee—the Joint Legislative Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. The most important product of these deliberations was enactment of AB 1725.

Earlier this year, the Legislature passed Resolution Chapter 43 (Alpert) which established a new Master Plan review committee. This latest Committee differs from earlier ones in that it responds to calls from the Legislative Analyst and others to develop a new master plan for kindergarten through the university level. Thus, it is entitled the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan—Kindergarten through University.

Because of the importance of the Master Plan, the League has developed this special publication and—under the direction of Rita Mize, Director of State Policy and Research—will publish a summary and analysis of hearings and reports throughout the multi-year process.